

ITEMS

VOLUME 8 · NUMBER 2 · JUNE 1954
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN MILITARY POLICY: A NEW PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR RESEARCH

by Gordon A. Craig and Bryce Wood

A NEW program of grants to individuals for research in the history of American military policy will be initiated by the Council in the autumn of 1954, on the basis of plans developed by the Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research.¹ Funds for the program have been provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The grants will be available to historians and other social scientists for research, including the preparation of monographs, on aspects of the broad field described in the present statement concerning the interests of the committee.

The committee was appointed in June 1952 for the purpose of defining areas needing research and of encouraging and assisting social scientists engaged in studying significant problems in civil-military relations. This appointment by the Council was the result of widening recognition of the new relationships that have developed in this field since World War II and of the importance of studying them in historical perspective. The early discussions by the committee took account of the fact that for the first time in its history the United States faced a situation in which it would long be required to maintain a state of high mobilization and to support a large military establishment. It was assumed that this situation would pose grave problems of public policy, if only because military considerations and military influence inevitably would play a greater part in all aspects of policy making than ever before in a country that tra-

ditionally has been inclined to fear military encroachments into the policy sphere.

The main task of the Council's committee was thus to help to identify some problems deriving from the admitted necessity for maintaining a peacetime military establishment of unprecedented size, to suggest ways in which such problems might be defined for research, to identify scholars who were qualified and ready to work on them, and to assist them to obtain financial aid if necessary. This was a large and perhaps overly ambitious task; and the committee undertook its planning in full consciousness of that fact.

Its efforts began on a very modest scale, with an initial stocktaking in the form of preparation of an annotated bibliography on the general area of civil-military relations between 1940 and 1952. This bibliography has just been published.² No comparable listing of books, articles, and government reports issued during those years exists. It is hoped that the bibliography will be helpful to scholars who are already working in the field of civil-military affairs, and may even induce a few more to enter it.

With the preparation of the bibliography, the committee undertook a survey of work in progress throughout the country, the results of which have been published in an article by the chairman of the committee.³ The survey revealed that—apart from the official Army and Navy projects on the history of the services in World

¹ The members of the committee are William T. R. Fox, Columbia University (chairman); Gordon A. Craig, Princeton University; John P. Miller, Yale University; and Harold Stein, Twentieth Century Fund; staff, Bryce Wood.

² *Civil-Military Relations: An Annotated Bibliography, 1940-1952* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954).

³ William T. R. Fox, "Civil-Military Relations Research," *World Politics*, January 1954, pp. 278-288.

War II—systematic research in the field of civil-military relations was under way at four main centers:

For the Twentieth Century Fund Harold Stein is directing a three-year program located at Princeton University. A series of case studies in civil-military relations is planned, together with study of the development of new governmental institutions concerned with national security policy.

At Dartmouth College John W. Masland and Laurence I. Radway are investigating the education of military officers who have participated, or may be expected to participate, in the formulation of national policies. Emphasis is being placed primarily on identifying the skills and attitudes that appear to contribute to the efficiency of such officers and the extent to which a cultivation of such skills is recognized in military education and training programs, or in the selection of officers for policy positions.

At the University of Michigan Morris Janowitz has been planning a program of comparative studies of changing patterns of civil-military relations in various Western countries. The focus will be on the professional soldier as such—his social characteristics, ideology, and motivations and his place in the political power structure of his own country. This is a long-time project, which is expected to proceed on the basis of informal cooperation among interested scholars.

Finally, at the Columbia University Institute of War and Peace Studies there are under way an analysis of the role of Congress in military policy and a study by William T. R. Fox on "Civilian and Military Perspectives on National Security Policy"—an investigation of the characteristics of those civilians and soldiers whose activities have to be related to each other at policy-making levels.

Aside from these projects, the committee's survey indicated that a great part of the work which could be described as even remotely connected with civil-military relations was either technical in nature (studies of military doctrine, for instance, or of military justice) or tendentious rather than scholarly. In particular, however, the survey revealed that remarkably little work was being done in some fields which are important in the context of modern concerns. During the past year the committee has given special attention to examining research possibilities in relation to such gaps in present knowledge.

One of these gaps is the important subject of the military policy of the United States. This the committee has defined as the flow of decisions at top levels of the political community regarding the size and composition of the armed forces and the methods and circumstances of the application of military strength. Military policy,

in other words, is made up of decisions about a nation's security position, the kinds of armed forces appropriate to that position, the occasions for sending the armed forces into action, and the limits to which they will be employed. The development of procedures and the functioning of organizations for the planning and making of relevant decisions form significant aspects of military policy as a whole. The history of military policy is, in the view of the committee, distinct from both diplomatic history and the history of military operations, although all three branches of history are closely connected. A nation's military policy presumably has a close relationship to its foreign policy, its economic policy, and the attitudes of its people toward the raising and employment of military force. It would seem logical that studies of civil-military problems in contemporary society would gain from a knowledge of what that relationship has been in the past—that it would, in short, be helpful to be able to consult a good history of United States military policy. Yet not only does no such history exist, but at present no one seems to be working on one.

The committee considered the reasons for this lack of interest and activity, in two conferences with historians of military affairs. The consensus of the participants was that no comprehensive history of military policy could yet be produced because of the startling lack of knowledge about this aspect of our past. It was pointed out that there is little available information on such divergent but important topics as:

- (1) The way in which purely military considerations influenced foreign policy, or vice versa, for any period before the outbreak of World War II;
- (2) The factors determining the use of the Navy in peacetime during the greater part of the nineteenth century;
- (3) The relationship between the militia system and the standing Army at various periods;
- (4) The limitations imposed by economic factors and fiscal policy on military policy.

It was concluded that, before anything like a comprehensive history could be written, the completion of basic monographic research was necessary, and suggestions were made concerning the way in which this might be encouraged.

The committee was sufficiently impressed by these considerations to recommend to the Council that it seek a sum of \$75,000 for the purpose of stimulating research in the history of American military policy. Favorable action by the Council and subsequently by the Carnegie Corporation of New York has permitted the committee to develop the program of grants that is now being announced.

The Council will offer grants for research in the history of American military policy to historians and other social scientists possessing the doctoral degree or its equivalent. Candidates for the awards may submit plans for studies dealing with military policy in any period of American history from 1750 to 1939, except for the period of the Civil War. In addition, proposals may have as their subjects the development of the influence of economic or technological or other factors on military policy over several periods. Also, proposals for studies in European history that have relevance to the history of American military policy will be considered.

Awards may be made for studies requiring a relatively short time for completion, or for projects requiring a substantial period of time. No definite limits with regard to time or amount of support have been

established. One form of grant, for example, would enable a scholar, who could make the necessary arrangements with his institution, to teach half time for a period of from one to perhaps three years and to devote half time to research. Other arrangements might be made for different circumstances and periods of time. Grants may be made for specific expenses of research, and also to cover all or a portion of the salary of a research worker for a limited period, but not for publication costs.

Individuals wishing to apply are invited to send a statement of their research proposals, educational qualifications, and research experience to Bryce Wood, Staff, Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research, Social Science Research Council, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C., not later than October 31, 1954.

THE CONFERENCE ON CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN RUSSIAN AND SOVIET THOUGHT

by Ernest J. Simmons

Two years ago the joint Committee on Slavic Studies¹ initiated plans for a conference on certain aspects of Russian intellectual history, a field that has hitherto received little attention from scholars in the United States. A steering committee of ten of the leading experts in the field of Russian studies was appointed and met for a two-day session, January 17-18, 1953. It was decided to hold a three-day conference on the broad theme of Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought. Under this theme six sections were organized, each on a special subject and with a chairman whose field of interest included that subject: Realism and Utopia in Russian Economic Thought, Alexander Gerschenkron; Authoritarianism and Democracy, Merle Fainsod; Collectivism and Individualism, Michael Karpovich; Rationality and Nonrationality, Geroid T. Robinson; Literature and Society, Ernest J. Simmons; The Messianic Concept, Philip E. Moseley. In the selection of the main theme and the special subjects under it, the committee hoped that the deliberations of the conference might throw light on a major problem: to what extent can develop-

ments in the Soviet Union be profitably studied and explained in terms of the intellectual history of the Russia of the tsars?

Under each of the six topics, four to five subtopics were selected as the subjects of research papers to be prepared by the participants in the conference. These papers were intended to effect a confrontation of various phases of pre- and postrevolutionary Russian and Soviet thought, and all of them in turn would represent an integrated thematic structure under the main theme of the conference. For the most part the subtopics were restricted in scope, and each participant was requested to sum up his research findings in some 25 pages. In nearly every case these participants were chosen because they had already done or were doing research in the immediate areas in which the subtopics fell. Twenty-six scholars in the field of Russian studies were chosen to write the following papers for the six sections of the conference:

Realism and Utopia in Russian Economic Thought

The Problem of Economic Development in Russian Intellectual History of the Nineteenth Century, Alexander Gerschenkron, Harvard University.

Populism and Early Russian Marxism on Ways of Economic Development of Russia, Solomon M. Schwarz, New York City.

Chernov and Agrarian Socialism before 1918, Oliver H. Radkey, University of Texas.

¹ The committee was appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council in 1948. The present members are: C. E. Black, Princeton University (chairman); William B. Edgerton, Pennsylvania State University (secretary); Abram Bergson, Columbia University; Merle Fainsod, Harvard University; H. H. Fisher, Stanford University; Waldemar Gurian, University of Notre Dame; Ernest J. Simmons, Columbia University; René Wellek, Yale University; and Sergius Yakobson, Library of Congress.

Stalin's Views on Soviet Economic Development,
Alexander Erlich, Harvard University.

Authoritarianism and Democracy

Pobedonostsev on the Instruments of Russian Government, Robert F. Byrnes, Rutgers University.

Two Types of Russian Liberalism (Maklakov and Miliukov), Michael Karpovich, Harvard University.

Lenin on the Party and the Trade Unions, 1893-1917, Thomas T. Hammond, University of Virginia.

Stalin and the Theory of Totalitarianism, Adam B. Ulam, Harvard University.

Collectivism and Individualism

Khomiakov on *Sobornost'*, Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, State University of Iowa.

Herzen and the Peasant Commune, Martin E. Malia, Harvard University.

Stalin and the Collective Farm, John D. Bergamini, Columbia University.

Vyshinsky's Concept of Collectivity, Julian Towster, University of California.

The Hero and Society, Rufus W. Mathewson, Jr., Columbia College.

Rationality and Nonrationality

Reason and Faith in the Philosophy of Solovyov, Georges Florovsky, St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary.

Partiinost' and Knowledge, Waldemar Gurian, University of Notre Dame.

Darwinism and the Russian Orthodox Church, George L. Kline, Columbia University.

The Crisis of Soviet Biology, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Columbia University.

Dialectic and Logic since the War, Herbert Marcuse, Columbia University and Harvard University.

Literature and Society

Social and Esthetic Values in Russian Nineteenth-Century Literary Criticism, René Wellek, Yale University.

Social and Esthetic Criteria in Soviet Russian Criticism, Victor Erlich, University of Washington.

The Rationale of Freedom and Repression in Pre-revolutionary Russian Literature, Leon Stilman, Columbia University.

Main Premises of the Communist Party in the Theory of Soviet Literary Controls, Robert M. Hankin, Columbia University.

The Messianic Concept

Herzen and Bakunin on Individual Liberty, Isaiah Berlin, Oxford University.

Dostoyevsky and Danilevsky: Nationalist Messianism, Hans Kohn, College of the City of New York.

The Messianic Concept in the Third International, 1935-39, Kermit E. McKenzie, Brooklyn College and Columbia University.

Great Russian Messianism in Postwar Soviet Ideology, Frederick C. Barghoorn, Yale University.

A period of nine months was allowed for the research and writing of the papers, which were then mimeographed and distributed to all participants and guests well in advance of the conference. In the meantime the six chairmen prepared extensive formal reviews of the papers in their sections. The reviews concentrated on confronting the findings of papers that dealt with themes before 1917 with the findings of those that treated subjects in the Soviet period, in an effort to bring out aspects of continuity or change in Russian and Soviet intellectual thought—the general theme of the conference.

Against the background of this careful preparation the conference was held at Arden House, Harriman, New York, on March 26-28, 1954. Thirty-nine participants and invited guests were present, representing 14 colleges and universities. In addition to participants and members of the committee, the guests were John N. Hazard of Columbia University, Robert McNeal of Columbia University, George A. Morgan of the Department of State, A. Philipov, formerly of the Universities of Kharkov and Prague, Franklin Reeve of Columbia College, Melville J. Ruggles of the RAND Corporation, Kenneth W. Thompson of the Rockefeller Foundation, and John Turkevich of Princeton University.

All the participants and guests attended each of the meetings of the six sections. The writer of each paper spoke to the gathering for 15 minutes on the substance of his research; the chairman then presented his review of the papers in his section, and a general discussion followed for about an hour and a half, at the conclusion of which each speaker answered questions. This discussion was recorded.

No attempt can be made here to abstract the conclusions that were reached on the main theme of the conference. The material presented was much too varied and rich to permit a comprehensive digest within a short space. It is perhaps sufficient to say that all participants and guests agreed that the meetings had resulted in a very significant contribution to the history of Russian and Soviet intellectual thought in general and to a solution of the many problems involved in the overall theme of the conference in particular. Further, all were agreed that a major volume should be prepared from the some 1,000 pages of manuscript which were produced by the participants. Steps toward preparation of such a volume are already under way.

SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTES: A NEW COUNCIL PROGRAM

THE Council has accepted from the Behavioral Sciences Division of the Ford Foundation funds for support, during the next four years, of summer institutes for postdoctoral training of social scientists. Acceptance of this grant makes possible an extension of the Council's activities designed to raise the standards of research by furthering the development of research workers in the social sciences. The relation of the new program to existing fellowship and other programs of the Council will be outlined later in this article.

In the present stage of rapid development of more efficient methods of research in social science, skills quickly become obsolete unless they are continually refreshed and extended, and many mature social scientists find themselves increasingly handicapped in keeping abreast of research in their own fields. Moreover, convergences of nominally distinct disciplines often make it desirable for a scholar to gain some command of the methods or content of a discipline in which he was not trained in his student days. At the same time, the accelerated pace of academic routines leaves faculty members little time for the needed study. The summer, which for many faculty members is not a vacation season but a period devoted by necessity to teaching for the sake of reducing the imbalance of family budgets, would be a logical time for study and self-development if this were economically feasible.

While no rigid specifications have been laid down for summer training institutes, the role of the Council will presumably include identifying and selecting groups of scholars with common interests, and university departments or other established agencies to assume responsibility for offering the desired training. The latter may sometimes find it expedient to recruit one or more staff members from other institutions. Funds may be provided by the Council to meet the costs of conducting courses or seminars, and for stipends to relieve participants of the necessity of teaching or other employment. The institute in mathematics for social scientists conducted by the Council in the summer of 1953 may be considered in some respects as a prototype of the proposed training institutes, but the Council does not propose to undertake the actual administration of the latter.

One institute has already been approved for support during the coming summer. A group of political scientists interested in the application of opinion and attitude survey methods will spend two months in an institute headed by Angus Campbell at the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. This program well exemplifies several desirable features of a postdoctoral

summer training institute. The Center and its staff can offer technical competence, wide experience in the methods under consideration, and a wealth of relevant empirical data. It is also pertinent to note that this institute for political scientists will be conducted separately from the regular summer session of the Survey Research Center, which is open to students with little if any advanced research experience. Thus the participants in the institute under Council sponsorship can devote undistracted attention to the problems in which they are mutually interested. The usual summer session with a heterogeneous student body obviously cannot provide such an opportunity.

Other institutes, which could be supported if sufficient interest should appear, might offer research workers training in the techniques, methods, and theories of disciplines in which they have had little or no previous training; or they might enable mature research workers to gain command of advanced methods developed in their own disciplines since their formal schooling ended. In general, it is expected that the summer training institutes will be devoted primarily to the acquisition of efficient research methods and techniques rather than substantive knowledge, as participants in the institutes can be expected to assimilate substantive knowledge by independent reading. In learning to use new "tools," however, even mature scholars who have long been accustomed to independent research can profit by group instruction under competent teachers, provided that the group has a sufficient common background of training and experience.

It may help to clarify the intended scope of the new program to comment on its relation to other Council programs. First, unlike the interuniversity summer research seminars described in the March 1954 issue of *Items* (pages 4-6), the summer research training institutes are designed to enable participants to understand and use methods and techniques that have already been developed. The emphasis in the latter will be on training, whereas the objective of the former is a collaborative attack on some research problem or a critical survey of a field of investigation. It is assumed that any research actually carried on in summer research training institutes will be only instrumental to learning new methods of research.

To some extent the purposes of the new institutes overlap those of the Council's long-standing program of postdoctoral research training fellowships. An individual who is prepared to devote a whole year to advanced research training would probably find a fellowship better

suit to his purpose. But the new program is premised on the belief that a shorter period of study during the summer vacation from regular academic duties can yield large returns in increased research competence if enough persons can be assembled to justify the expense of providing intensive special instruction under optimum conditions.

The Council does not expect to announce training institutes on predetermined subjects, but in accordance with its general policy of trying to deal with actual needs of social scientists, it will welcome inquiries and proposals from those who would be interested in particular kinds of training. As already indicated, the organization of an institute depends on the identification of a group of social scientists (normally with the Ph.D. and some prior research experience) who desire training

in some particular area of research methods, and an institution at which arrangements can be made to provide the desired training. Proposals will naturally be more persuasive if the proponents are able to nominate a number of colleagues who are already actively interested in undertaking a particular program, but the Council's staff will endeavor to assist in discovering others with like interests if a proposed plan appears promising but the number of prospective participants is insufficient to warrant immediate negotiation with a university.

Inquiries will be welcome at any time. As the organization of an institute may involve coordination of the personal plans of a dozen or more individuals, negotiations for a summer session may well be initiated no later than the preceding autumn.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Richard Hartshorne, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spenger.

A conference on strategic factors in periods of especially rapid economic growth—the first of four conferences which the committee is sponsoring or cosponsoring during 1954—was held in New York on April 9–10. Discussion centered on four papers that had been prepared and circulated in advance: on structure and balance in the economic growth of Mexico since 1939, by Henry G. Aubrey of the New School for Social Research; on economic progress in Canada since 1913, by A. W. Currie of the Department of Political Economy, University of Toronto; on growth factors in the Italian economy between 1880 and 1914, by Bruno Foa, economic consultant in New York City; and on factors operative in western Europe from 1540 to 1640, by John U. Nef of the Committee on Social Thought, University of Chicago. The discussion of the several papers was led, respectively, by Nathan L. Whetten, dean of the Graduate School, University of Connecticut; Penelope Hartland, formerly of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Paul N. Rosenstein-Rodan, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and A. P. Usher, visiting professor in the Department of Economics, Yale University. In addition, a summary of a paper analyzing the intellectual factors affecting Russian economic development in the nineteenth century was presented by Alexander Gerschenkron of the Department of Economics, Harvard University. Other participants included J. Bartlet Brebner, Department of History, Columbia University; Pietro Castiglioni, New York office of the Banco Nazionale del Lavoro; Mario Einaudi, Department of Government,

Cornell University; Paul T. Ellsworth, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin; Norman J. G. Pounds, Department of Geography, Indiana University; John E. Sawyer, Department of Economics, Yale University; Robert S. Smith, Department of Economics, Duke University; as well as four members of the committee: Messrs. Clough, Hartshorne, Kuznets, and Moore. Mr. Clough, who planned and organized the conference on behalf of the committee, is preparing an article summarizing the principal lines of thought that emerged during the discussion, for publication in an appropriate journal. A limited number of copies of the papers and of comments prepared by the principal discussants are being bound together in mimeographed form for distribution to those attending the conference and others actively interested in the work of the committee.

A second conference, sponsored jointly by the committee and the University of Chicago Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change was held in Chicago on May 24–26. This conference dealt with the role of cities in economic growth and cultural change. A more detailed report on the program will appear in the next issue of *Items*.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADVANCED TRAINING (Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)

Charles E. Odegaard (chairman), M. H. Trytten (vice-chairman), Donald Bridgman, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, C. W. de Kiewiet, Ovid W. Eshbach, E. D. Grizzell, Quinn McNamara, Ralph A. Sawyer, Frederick F. Stephan, Paul Webink, Malcolm M. Willey; Director, Dael Wolfe.

The Commission's principal report, *America's Resources of Specialized Talent: A Current Appraisal and a Look Ahead*, prepared by Dael Wolfe, is scheduled to be published by Harper & Brothers in September 1954. The re-

port presents the results of a series of studies initiated in the autumn of 1950. It includes an analysis of the past growth, current size, and prospective supply and demand in the natural and social sciences, the humanities, and each of the principal professional areas; an analysis of characteristics of students specializing in each of these fields; an examination of the potential supply of young people who, with appropriate training, could become qualified for effective work in the scientific and professional fields; and a

consideration of policy problems affecting the best utilization of the actual and potential supply.

Several supplementary studies, including an analysis of outstanding high school students who did not attend college and an exploration of personality factors that may differentiate the individuals who enter various fields of specialization, are to be completed by September 30, when the Commission's operations will terminate. A final review of the Commission's work will appear in a future issue of *Items*.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL RECEIVES LORD AND TAYLOR AWARD

On May 3, 1954, one of the annual Lord and Taylor Awards was presented to the Council "for increasing our knowledge of man and of human relations through research and training in the social sciences." The other two awards in the seventeenth annual series were presented to the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and to the Kips Bay - Yorkville Adult Counseling Center and its research counterpart, Cornell Medical College's Studies in Gerontology. All three awards were for pioneering work in fields of human development. The award to the Council was accepted by Pendleton Herring, President of the Council, who said:

"As the Lord and Taylor award comes to the Social Science Research Council, I wish to express our deep appreciation of this honor and our realization that the award, in a wider sense, is bestowed upon the many hundreds of social scientists throughout the country who have made the Council effective over the years.

"It is our job in the Council to select promising young people for fellowships, to bring together able scholars to plan basic research, and to consider the directions that further inquiries should take in order to achieve a clearer understanding of man and society. For more than a quarter of a century, our task has been to seek out research talent and research leads. It is unusual, indeed, for the Council to be even momentarily in the spotlight. I must say we are both surprised—and pleased!

"It seems to me that this present recognition of the work of the Council has a larger significance: it emphasizes the growing *general* awareness that human relations can be studied systematically and objectively. The aim is not to provide pat answers but, rather, better *methods* for analyzing and handling our common problems. There has never been greater need than at present for the wise use of such methods of analysis and for wider public recognition of their value."

PERSONNEL

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS AWARDED IN 1954

The committees in charge of the fellowships, grants, and other awards offered by the Council held meetings in March and recommended appointments for the 109 persons whose names are listed on the following pages. In addition, awards of first-year graduate study fellowships were offered last February to 16 college seniors who had held undergraduate research stipends for the summer of 1953, as announced in the March issue of *Items* (pages 11-12).

Grants-in-aid of research were offered to 30 mature scholars in support of their independent research. Awards of research training fellowships were offered to 28 persons, as compared with the 39 appointments made by the Committee on Social Science Personnel in the spring of 1953. Faculty research fellowships were awarded to 6 college and

university social science teachers, making a total of 29 appointments since these awards were first offered in 1950.

Area research training fellowships and travel grants for area research, which were offered during the six-year period 1948-53, were not available in 1954. Discontinuation of the area fellowship program was followed by a significant increase in the number of applications received for the regular research training fellowships and grants-in-aid of research, with the result that a smaller proportion of candidates could be offered awards in 1954 than in previous years. It has been possible, however, to support some persons seeking further area training or wishing to undertake research on the cultures of particular world areas.

A second series of appointments in the three-year experimental program for undergraduate research training was made this spring. Although somewhat fewer candidates were

nominated by faculty sponsors for undergraduate research stipends this year, a larger proportion of the nominees were found eligible and a few more appointments were made in 1954 than in the previous year. The 45 college juniors offered stipends this year represent 36 colleges in 18 states from every region of the country, as well as Hawaii, Canada, and the District of Columbia. Two fifths of the appointees are students in independent liberal arts colleges, while the remainder are in universities. Awards were distributed among the following social science disciplines: psychology 18, sociology 10, anthropology 5, history 5, political science 5, and economics 2. The holders of undergraduate research stipends will be eligible to compete for first-year graduate study fellowships to be awarded next year.

AWARDS TO BE OFFERED IN 1955

All the types of awards offered in 1954 will again be available in 1955, on substantially the same terms as before. In addition, study grants will be available to a limited number of persons selected for admission to the 1955 sessions of the summer institute in mathematics for social scientists. It is hoped that definite arrangements for one session at a mid-western institution and another on the Pacific Coast will be completed in the near future.

Plans call for the usual distribution, probably in October, of a general announcement of awards to be offered in 1955. Interested persons are invited to ask that their names be placed on the mailing list. Requests should be addressed to the Washington office of the Council at 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Recent renewals of grants from the supporting foundations assure continuation through 1959 of two of the Council's basic programs, faculty research fellowships and grants-in-aid of research. The Carnegie Corporation of New York has granted the Council the sum of \$465,000 for faculty research fellowships for a second five-year period beginning in 1955. Although these awards will be offered on essentially the same basis as before, some modifications of the program will be announced in the fall. The Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships hopes especially to correct misconceptions about the scope of the program and to encourage the nomination of more younger scholars who have demonstrated their high competence for research, but who have not yet enjoyed extensive opportunities for independent research commensurate with their talents.

A new appropriation from the Rockefeller Foundation assures continuation of the grant-in-aid program for the next five years. For 1955 the Foundation has provided a sum twice as large as has been available annually heretofore, but diminishing amounts have been allocated for subsequent years, so that support for 1958 and 1959 will be the same as in 1954 and earlier years. This "tapering" grant conforms to a pattern often followed by the donor in the hope that continuing support at the higher level may be secured elsewhere. Changes, if any, in rules governing grants-in-aid for 1955 will be announced early next autumn, but any major departure from present rules is unlikely since the

demand for small grants has perennially exceeded the resources.

In addition to the fellowships and other awards mentioned above, a complete list of Council programs under which individuals may receive support for research or training would include the interuniversity summer research seminar program described in the March issue of *Items* (pages 4-6), and the new program of summer research training institutes described on pages 17-18 *supra*. Inquiries concerning the latter programs will be welcome at any time.

FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

At its meeting on March 29 the Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul W. Gates, Harold E. Jones, Donald G. Marquis, Dorothy S. Thomas, Schuyler C. Wallace, and Malcolm M. Willey—selected 6 fellows for three-year appointments beginning in the fall of 1954. With the cooperation of their respective institutions the fellows will be enabled to devote at least half of their time to their own research while carrying on reduced teaching schedules. The appointments follow:

Walter D. Fisher, Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology, Kansas State College, for research on methodological aspects of estimating consumer demand and market behavior.

John A. Garraty, Assistant Professor of History, Michigan State College, for application of psychological techniques, particularly the content analysis of personal documents, to the study of history and biography.

Wayne H. Holtzman, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Texas, for development of quantitative procedures for the evaluation of personality.

Samuel P. Huntington, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University, for research on military institutions and American government.

Vincent A. Ostrom, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Oregon, for an analysis of political policy formation in a local community.

Philip Selznick, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, for codification of empirically based theory in the sociology of law, and study of the role of value systems in the judicial process.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—Earl Latham (chairman), Harry Alpert, Ralph L. Beals, Richard B. Heflebower, John H. Rohrer, and Paul Webbink—met on March 22-23 and voted to award 28 research training fellowships:

Helen P. Beem, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on primary groups and for further related technical training.

Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of North Carolina, postdoctoral fellowship for study of systematic theory at Harvard University and research on race relations.

Richard H. Bliss, Ph.D. candidate in history, Cornell University, for research on the social history of agriculture in Lewis County, New York.

Vernon R. Dorjahn, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, postdoctoral fellowship for research in Sierra Leone, British West Africa, on demographic factors in the social organization of the Timne.

Otto Eckstein, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Harvard University, for research on economic criteria for United States government investment programs.

Stanley M. Elkins, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for a critical study of American historiography (joint project with Eric L. McKittrick).

John H. Fenton, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in government, Harvard University, for research on political dynamics in Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, 1912-52.

Joshua A. Fishman, Ph.D. in psychology, Teachers College, postdoctoral fellowship for training in quantitative research methods.

David Gold, Ph.D. in sociology, University of Chicago, Assistant Professor of Sociology, State University of Iowa, for training in mathematical statistics at the University of North Carolina.

Arthur S. Goldberger, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Michigan, for econometric research on the money and capital sector of the United States economy.

Lee A. Peter Gosling, Ph.D. candidate in geography, University of Michigan, for research in Malaya on the production of food crops.

Andrew Hacker, Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for training at the University of Michigan in research methods applicable to study of social and political attitudes.

O. J. Harvey, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Oklahoma, postdoctoral fellowship for advanced training at Yale University in research on attitude change.

John H. Kareken, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for research on internal democracy in trade unions.

Carol Kaye, Ph.D. candidate in social psychology, University of Michigan, postdoctoral fellowship for training in clinical psychological techniques applicable in research.

William J. McGuire, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Yale University, postdoctoral fellowship for training at the University of Minnesota in group dynamics.

Eric L. McKittrick, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for a critical study of American historiography (joint project with Stanley M. Elkins).

Sheldon L. Messinger, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on administrative processes in the California prison system.

Marc Nerlove, Ph.D. candidate in political economy, Johns Hopkins University, for econometric research at the University of Chicago on the livestock feed market.

Robert W. Oliver, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Princeton University, for advanced training and research in England on international cooperation in overseas investment.

Thomas C. Rowan, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Illinois, postdoctoral fellowship for mathematical training at the University of Michigan.

Marshall D. Sahlins, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, postdoctoral fellowship for research in the southern Fiji Islands on the contact between two differently organized primitive societies.

Franz Samelson, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for research on the effects of group pressures on individuals' judgments.

Arnold Schrier, Ph.D. candidate in history, Northwestern University, for research in Ireland on influences resulting from emigration to the United States.

Joseph Veroff, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for research on the measurement of human motives.

Rose Wax, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Stanford University, for research in California and Mexico on the adaptation of Mexicans and Mexican Americans to industrialization.

Elmus R. Wicker, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Duke University, for research on the investment criteria employed by British agencies for colonial development.

Joseph F. Zygmunt, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Chicago, for experimental studies of interpersonal relationships.

GRANTS-IN-AID

At its annual meeting on March 25 the Committee on Grants-in-Aid—George W. Stocking (chairman), Richard S. Crutchfield, Edward C. Kirkland, Harvey C. Mansfield, and John W. Riley, Jr.—voted awards to 30 scholars in support of their individual research projects:

Kenneth O. Bjork, Professor of History, St. Olaf College, for research on Norwegian migration to the American Pacific Coast.

Joseph A. Boromé, Assistant Professor of History, College of the City of New York, for research in England and France on a history of the island of Dominica (British West Indies) from its discovery by Columbus in 1493 to the present day.

Donald R. Cressey, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for research in the British West Indies on the relationships between societal reactions to crime and social structures.

Charles C. Cumberland, Assistant Professor of History, Rutgers University, for research in Mexico and the United States on the Mexican Revolution: development of revolutionary concepts, 1913-23.

Edwin A. Davis, Professor of History, Louisiana State University, for research in Mexico on the history of the City of Mexico.

James A. Field, Jr., Associate Professor of History, Swarthmore College, for research on nineteenth century American activity in the Mediterranean and Near East.

Walter O. Filley, Jr., Assistant Professor of Government, Wesleyan University, for a comparative study in Canada of the Liberal and Conservative Parties, 1919-54.

Grace Fox, Lecturer, Goucher College, for research in England on Anglo-Japanese relations, 1884-1902.

Henry Gleitman, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Swarthmore College, for research on the conditions of incidental learning.

Norman A. Graebner, Associate Professor of History, Iowa State College, for a political and economic analysis of the period of the James K. Polk presidency.

Joseph H. Greenberg, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University, for research in Northern Nigeria on language contact and acculturation in the Bauchi Plateau.

John L. Haer, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Florida State University, for research on community and neighborhood attitudes in relation to social interaction in a semitransient residential area.

Mark D. Hirsch, Teacher, High School of Music and Art, New York City, for a political history of New York City since the Civil War: from Tweed to LaGuardia.

Frank W. Klingberg, Associate Professor of History, University of North Carolina, for a study of the thinking of Southern Unionists.

Werner S. Landecker, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan, for research on class crystallization in a metropolitan area.

Albert Lauterbach, Social Science Department, Sarah Lawrence College, for research in Great Britain, Norway, and Western Germany on managerial attitudes in private and public enterprises.

Bryce D. Lyon, Assistant Professor of History, Harvard University, for a comparative study in France, England, and the Low Countries of the administrative institutions of medieval Western Europe.

Samuel C. McCulloch, Associate Professor of History and Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Rutgers University, for research in Australia on the history of Eastern Australia, 1835-50.

William N. Parker, Assistant Professor of Economics, Williams College, for research in France, Luxembourg, and Germany on the development and integration of Western European coal, iron, and steel industries in the twentieth century (joint project with Norman J. G. Pounds).

Norman J. G. Pounds, Professor of Geography, Indiana University, for research in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Great Britain on the development and integration of Western European coal, iron, and steel industries in the twentieth century (joint project with William N. Parker).

Howard H. Quint, Associate Professor of History, University of South Carolina, for a study of the career and social thought of Gaylord Wilshire.

Benjamin Rivlin, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brooklyn College, for research in France and North Africa on Franco-Moslem relations.

Paul F. Sharp, Associate Professor of History, Iowa State College, for research on the Whoop-Up Country: a study in Canadian-American regionalism, 1865-85.

James W. Silver, Professor of History, University of Mississippi, for research on public opinion in the Confederacy.

M. Marion Spector, Ph.D. in history, Columbia University, for research on the career of William Knox, Tory pamphleteer and bureaucrat, during the French Revolution.

Alice R. Stewart, Associate Professor of History, University of Maine, for research in Canada and England on Canadian-imperial relations, 1891-1914.

George V. Taylor, Assistant Professor of History, University of North Carolina, for research in France on political activities of French businessmen and business groups during the French Revolution, 1789-95.

S. Y. Teng, Associate Professor of History, Indiana University, for research in England, France, Germany, and Holland on the diplomatic relations between the Taiping Rebellion and western powers, 1851-64.

Evon Z. Vogt, Jr., Assistant Professor of Social Anthropology, Harvard University, for research in western Mexico on the acculturation of the Huichol and Cora Indians.

Emilio Willems, Professor of Anthropology, Vanderbilt University, for research in Portugal on some aspects of Portuguese social structure.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH STIPENDS

The Committee on Undergraduate Research Training—Douglas McGregor (chairman), R. F. Arragon, E. Adamson Hoebel, Robert B. MacLeod, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and George E. Simpson—met on March 15-16 and voted to award 45 undergraduate research stipends for the summer of 1954:

Ellen Weber; supervisor, Howard P. Smith, Social Science Division, Bennington College; study of the personality attributes of nationalistic and world-minded individuals.

Kathryn A. Huggins; supervisor, David G. Mandelbaum, Professor of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley; analysis of the local councils, *panchayats*, in villages in India as an instrument of self-government and social change.

Herman Stekler; supervisors, Robert F. Campbell, Associate Professor of American History, and Morris H. Cohen, Associate Professor of Government, Clark University; case study of the effect of pressure groups on the formation of international trade policy in the copper industry.

Norman Hoffman; supervisors, Alfred L. Baldwin, Professor of Child Development and Family Relationships, and William W. Lambert, Associate Professor of Psychology, Cornell University; cross-cultural analysis of the relation of child training practices to adult behavior, with particular reference to aggression.

Bernard E. Segal; supervisor, George F. Theriault, Professor of Sociology, Dartmouth College; investigation of the attitudes of the Jewish minority toward the gentile majority in a New England town.

John D. Fite; supervisors, John M. Bevan, Assistant Professor of Psychology, and W. Gatewood Workman, Professor of Psychology, Davidson College; experimental test of the effects of differing competitive situations on learning and retention.

Vincent Y. Cremata, Jr.; supervisor, Robert Anderson, Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Archaeology, Florida State University; field study of the survival of Crow culture elements.

Robert S. Blacklow; supervisor, Richard L. Solomon, Associate Professor of Social Psychology, Harvard University; study of experimentally induced repression.

Roger D. Masters; supervisor, Carl Kaysen, Assistant Professor of Economics, Harvard University; theoretical analysis of the oligopoly situation in an attempt at a new definition of "workable competition."

Walter H. McLaughlin, Jr.; supervisor, Samuel P. Huntington, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University; analysis of the effect of questions of national defense on political behavior.

John F. Merrifield; supervisor, Gardner Lindzey, Lecturer on Clinical Psychology and Research Associate, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University; exploration

tion of the relation between fantasy measures and independent measures of motivational states.

Myra-Jo Okazaki; supervisor, W. Edgar Vinacke, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Hawaii; study of a group of Japanese-Americans who have been rapidly assimilated into Occidental-American culture.

Roberta S. Blacker; supervisor, Gerrit P. Judd, IV, Professor of History, Hofstra College; historical investigation of the influence of Americans of non-British origin as a factor leading to the American Revolution.

Mary K. Abbott; supervisor, Sister Gertrude Mary, Professor of Social Sciences, College of the Holy Names; analysis of changes in the concept of treason in American history as a function of changing political environment.

Donald C. Ferguson; supervisor, Charles E. Osgood, Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois; research in experimental linguistics, dealing with the relation between the components and composites of word combinations.

Beatrice B. Lauter, Indiana University; supervisors, Jesse D. Clarkson, Professor of History, Brooklyn College, and Robert H. Ferrell, Assistant Professor of History, Indiana University; study of William C. Bullitt's diplomatic activities as ambassador to Russia.

Wsevolod W. Isajiw; supervisor, Brother D. Augustine, F.S.C., Professor of Sociology, La Salle College; examination of the social status of recent Ukrainian immigrants in Philadelphia.

Marjorie Vaughan; supervisor, J. Henry Korson, Professor of Sociology, University of Massachusetts; study of hypothesized divergences between professed norms and actual behavior in the field of race relations in a Northern community.

Diana L. Hewitt; supervisor, Gerhard E. Lenski, Instructor in Sociology, University of Michigan; empirical investigation of the hypothesis that changes in the religious behavior of individuals accompany changes in their social status.

Mary Jean Perkins; supervisor, Allen D. Calvin, Instructor in Psychology, Michigan State College; investigation of concept formation in children.

Jane K. Reynolds; supervisor, Albert H. Ewell, Jr., Instructor in Psychology, Middlebury College; measurement of the relationship between conceptual rigidity and the rigidity of moral values.

Marjorie J. Schaefer; supervisor, James J. Jenkins, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota; experimental study of the patterning of language habits of the individual.

Louise E. Merz; supervisor, Leonard I. Pearlin, Instructor in Sociology, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina; analysis of the relationship of cognitive, emotional, and motivational factors in prejudice toward Negroes.

Igor Kopytoff; supervisor, Francis L. K. Hsu, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University; systematic analysis of the process of change in certain Siberian cultures.

Kamal Hossain; supervisor, John E. Hughes, Instructor in Sociology, University of Notre Dame; analysis of social and economic aspects of illiteracy in Pakistan.

Michael M. Horowitz; supervisor, Ralph H. Turner, Associate Professor of Psychology, Oberlin College; observational study of attitude and behavior changes in a boys' camp.

Daniel R. Stein; supervisor, J. Milton Yinger, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Oberlin College; field study of the clergy in a community.

Evelyn H. Cohen; supervisor, Frank P. Bakes, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania; experimental study of the attitudes of children with speech defects, their parents, and the public toward speech disorders.

Stephen Fox; supervisor, Eugene H. Galanter, Instructor in Psychology, University of Pennsylvania; laboratory investigation of individual differences in the dimensions of visual experience.

Dale W. Jorgenson, Reed College; supervisors, Courtney Cleland, Assistant Professor of Sociology, and Norman Wengert, Professor of Social Sciences, North Dakota Agricultural College; test of Bogue's hypothesis of metropolitan dominance through an analysis of the Great Plains region.

Gail M. Kelly; supervisor, David H. French, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Reed College; field study of the Warm Springs Indians to identify and analyze culture themes.

Clifford H. Block; supervisor, Burton G. Andreas, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Rochester; experimental study of the relations between verbal learning and verbal fluency.

Mary J. Jennings; supervisor, Merle B. Turner, Assistant Professor of Psychology, San Diego State College; exploration of the personalistic approach in case studies of illegal Mexican entrants to the United States.

Paul H. Noyes; supervisor, Laurence D. Lafore, Associate Professor of History, Swarthmore College; study in Great Britain of wage and employment factors in the rise and decline of Chartist activities among factory workers, 1838-48.

H. Laurence Ross; supervisor, Arthur Gladstone, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Swarthmore College; observational study of factors affecting aggressive behavior in a children's camp.

Hugh W. Ripley; supervisor, Harry H. Pierce, Assistant Professor of History, Syracuse University; historical analysis of foreign investments in the Illinois Central Railroad, 1852-1942.

Charlotte Lubin; supervisor, Claude C. Bowman, Professor of Sociology, Temple University; study of codes of dating behavior among urban high school girls.

L. Elizabeth Reilly; supervisor, A. H. Shephard, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Toronto; laboratory investigation of the secondary reinforcing properties of a visual stimulus.

Margaret M. Kruse, Trinity College; supervisors, Sister Miriam Therese, Department of Sociology, Trinity College, and John J. O'Connor, Professor of History and Philosophy, Georgetown University; study of the Catholic interracial movement in New York City, 1934-54.

Gloria Schaffer; supervisor, Charles E. Dibble, Professor of Anthropology, University of Utah; study of the herbs of Aztec pharmacopoeia and their use in Aztec ritual.

Forbes B. Hays; supervisor, Daniel R. Grant, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Vanderbilt University; for study of places of residence of metropolitan leadership groups in relation to their influence on public policy in the central city.

W. Eric Gustafson; supervisor, Emile Despres, Professor

of Economics, Williams College; study of wage differentials, 1940-53, to assess the effects of inflation on the American wage structure.

Joseph E. Bachelder, III and Stephen E. DeForest; supervisor, R. Barry Farrell, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University; study of the relation between

general public opinion and elite opinion in America on foreign policy.

Peter B. Field; supervisor, Irving L. Janis, Associate Professor of Psychology, Yale University; investigation of the personality factors involved in susceptibility to persuasive communications.

PUBLICATIONS

COUNCIL BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Labor Mobility in Six Cities: A Report on the Survey of Patterns and Factors in Labor Mobility, 1940-1950, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer, with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, for the Committee on Labor Market Research. New York: Social Science Research Council, June 1954. 192 pp. Paper, \$2.25; cloth, \$2.75. *Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability*, Bulletin 55, revised edition, by Roger G. Barker, in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, Mollie R. Gonick. April 1953. 456 pp. \$2.00.

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pp. Cloth, \$3.00. *Support for Independent Scholarship and Research* by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00. *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research*, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.

The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

OTHER BOOKS

Modern Learning Theory: A Critical Analysis of Five Examples, by William K. Estes, Sigmund Koch, Kenneth MacCorquodale, Paul E. Meehl, Conrad G. Mueller, William N. Schoenfeld, William S. Verplanck, with the editorial assistance of A. T. Poffenberger. Report on the Dartmouth Conference (Inter-university Summer Research Seminar) on Learning Theory, 1950. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, May 1954. Probable price, \$5.00.

The Voter Decides, by Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. Report on the University of Michigan Survey Research Center study of voting behavior in the 1952 presidential election, sponsored by the Committee on Political Behavior. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, May 1954. \$4.75. *Civil-Military Relations: An Annotated Bibliography, 1940-1952*. Prepared under the direction of the Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research. New York: Columbia University Press, May 1954. 154 pp. \$2.00.

COUNCIL PAMPHLETS

Bibliographies on Personality and Social Development of the Child, Pamphlet 10, compiled by Christoph Heinicke and Beatrice B. Whiting. June 1953. 138 pp. \$1.00.

Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pp. 50 cents.

Area Studies in American Universities by Wendell C. Bennett. 1951. 92 pp. \$1.00.

Domestic Control of Atomic Energy, Pamphlet 8, by Robert A. Dahl and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. 1951. 122 pp. \$1.00.

The Council's monographs, bulletins, and pamphlets are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1954: RAY A. BILLINGTON, TAYLOR COLE, GORDON A. CRAIG, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, LUTHER GULICK, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, ERNEST R. HILGARD, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, D. GALE JOHNSON, V. O. KEY, ALEXANDER H. LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS McGREGOR, JOHN P. MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, ROY F. NICHOLS, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, HERBERT WECHSLER, S. S. WILKS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, President; PAUL WEBBINK, Vice-President; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, Executive Associate; HAROLD E. JONES, Pacific Coast Representative; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; ROBERT N. WILSON; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, Financial Secretary